

JUL 28 2006

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated May 3, 2006, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejected claims 1-23 under 35 USC 101 for double-patenting, and rejected claims 1-23 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Mullendore (US Patent publication 2003/0185154). In response thereto, the Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 21. Claims 1-23 remain at issue.

The 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

The Applicants have amended claim 1 to address the antecedent basis issues with regard to the "write frame command" and OX_ID and RX_ID. With regard to the "if" limitation, the applicants disagree with the Examiner's rejection. The claim clearly recites that the trapping mechanism traps the write frame command if the write command designates a predetermined Host_ID and a predetermined target_ID.

The applicants have also made a number of minor amendments to claims 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 21 to correct other minor informalities.

The 35 USC 101 Double Patenting Rejection

The Applicants have expressed abandoned US application 10/791,660. Copies of the expressed abandonment are enclosed herewith for the Examiner's convenience. The rejection is now moot.

The Art Rejection

The Examiner has rejected the claims as anticipated by Mullendore. The Applicants strongly disagree. The reference does not anticipate the present invention as claimed.

As illustrated in Figure 2A of the present invention, SCSI command frames define a Fibre Channel (FC) header 20, SCSI header 22, and a FC cyclical redundancy check (CRC). The FC header 20 includes, as illustrated in Figure 3, an originator Exchange Identifier (OX_ID) field and a Receiver Exchange Identifier (RX_ID). In other words, the two field are used to identify the originating Host and the target device for a given transaction.

In the prior art, the initiating Host defines both the OX_ID and the RX_ID for a given command. Each transaction used to implement the command contains the OX_ID and the RX_ID so that the exchanges can be successfully sent and received between the Host and the

target. Without the OX_ID and the RX_ID, exchanges could not navigate across the Switches of the network from the Host to the target or vice versa. The Switches between the host and target simply act as an intermediary, passing the exchanges on between the Host and the target. The Switches do not alter or change the OX_ID or the RX_ID.

The Mullendore reference appears to operate in the same manner as the prior art described above. Paragraphs [0059] through [0062] and Figure 4 describe and illustrate a "Fast Write Enabled". Absolutely nowhere in the noted portions of Mullendore, which the Examiner relied on in the rejection, does it teach or even suggest that the Switch (150) modify or alter the OX_ID or the RX_ID designating the originating Host or the target device in any way.

Paragraph [0061] describes the Fast Write of Mullendore in detail. When the Fast Write is enabled, the Switch 150 does not issue a Ready-to-Transfer (RTT) message unless the Switch has buffer resources available to buffer the data of the entire write operation or some threshold amount (e.g., 256KB). If the original write command transfers less than the threshold amount, or the buffer resources are available for all the data, then the RTT message is immediately issued. If the original write command transfers more than the available buffer space, then the RTT message is generated only when the buffer space becomes available. If the write command transfers more data than the threshold, then the multiple threshold sized RTT messages are generated as buffer space becomes available.

Paragraph [0029] simply discusses a switch having a buffer. There is no teaching of modify the OX_ID or RX_ID of a command what so ever.

Absolutely nowhere in paragraph [0061] or [0029] does the Mullendore reference teach or suggest the modification of the OX_ID and RX_ID fields of a write command. The Examiners statement in paragraph 11 of the Office Action, which recites that "*(paragraphs 0029 and 0061 discloses the processor within the switch is able to partially transfer the write command, which is to modify it. ...)*" is therefore both false and groundless. The statement is false because there is absolutely no teaching in Mullendore about modifying a write command. Furthermore, the conclusion by the Examiner that the buffering of the data of a write command is somehow the same as modifying the OX_ID and RX_ID fields of a write command is without merit. Modifying the two fields is very different than buffering the data of a write command into 256KB (i.e., the threshold size) blocks at a switch.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

James W. Rose
Reg. No. 34,239

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
650-961-8300

JUL 28 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COPY

In re application of: Basavaiah, et al.

Attorney Docket No.: ANDIP037A

Application No.: 10/791,660

Examiner: Unelus, Ernest

Filed: March 1, 2004

Group: 2181

Title: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR
PERFORMING FAST FIBRE CHANNEL WRITE
OPERATIONS OVER RELATIVELY HIGH
LATENCY NETWORKS

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to fax number 571-273-8300 to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on July 28, 2006.

Signed: _____

Agnes Spence

EXPRESS ABANDONMENT OF APPLICATION (37 CFR 1.138)

Mail Stop 313(c)
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The applicant hereby expressly abandons this case.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

James W. Rose
Registration No. 34,239

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
650-961-8300